

Costelytra meets both requirements, *Chlorochiton* does not meet the first requirement, and *Costleya* meets neither requirement.

As stated in my original application, the validation of *Chlorochiton* 'seems an exaggerated use of the plenary powers when a more elegant and simple solution can be found by designating *M. suturalis* Fabricius as the type species of *Stethaspis*'. I must, therefore, on both practical and nomenclatural grounds, oppose Pope's proposal to validate *Chlorochiton*.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF
TEIIDAE GRAY, 1827, Z.N.S. 1920

(see vol. 38, pp. 194-196)

By Hobart M. Smith and Rozella B. Smith

(Department of Environmental, Population and Organismic Biology,
University of Colorado 80309, U.S.A.)

and David Chiszar (Department of Psychology, UCB)

Certainly the long history of universal acceptance of the family name TEIIDAE, without effective competition of other names for the same taxon, justifies its conservation.

However, it appears that TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825, may not be available since in that work *Tupinambis* was not regarded as valid, but was synonymized in error with '*Uranus* Merrem', 1820, an emendation of *Varanus* Merrem, 1820 (family VARANIDAE Gray, 1827). The only other genera recognized in the family were *Ada* Gray, 1825 (= *Dracaena* Daudin, 1802), *Teius* Merrem, 1820, and *Ameiva* 'Say' (=Meyer, 1795). Art. 11(e) requires that a family-group name 'be based on the name then valid for a contained genus', hence TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825, is not available, nor am I aware that any other author has adopted the name at any family-group level.

Therefore it seems appropriate to modify this request to make plain that TUPINAMBIDAE Gray is not available, rather than making it junior to TEIIDAE Gray, 1827, 'when both names are applied to the same taxon.' The rest of the requests merit approval.

At the same time another name, the family AMEIVOIDEA Fitzinger, 1826 (p.21) should be delegated junior status when applied to the same taxon as the name TEIIDAE Gray, 1827. Fitzinger's name is based on *Ameiva* 'Cuvier' (=Meyer, 1795), which he included in the family. All requirements of the Code for availability of Fitzinger's name AMEIVOIDEA are met except for its ending, of which Art. 11 (e)(ii) permits correction, without alteration of original date and authorship, in properly emended form, conforming with Art. 29 (i.e., rendering it AMEIVIDAE).

We suggest that this petition request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (type genus *Teius* Merrem, 1820) is to be given nomenclatural precedence over AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (type genus *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795) whenever the two names are applied to the same taxon;

(2) to place the following names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) [as in Presch, 1981];

(b) [as in Presch, 1981];

- (c) *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795 (gender: feminine), type species by monotypy, *Ameiva americana* Meyer, 1795 (= *Lacerta ameiva ameiva* Linnaeus, 1758 = *Ameiva a. ameiva* [Linnaeus]);
- (3) to place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
- (a) [as in Presch, 1981];
- (b) [as in Presch, 1981];
- (c) *ameiva* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Lacerta ameiva* (valid specific name of the type species of *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795);
- (4) to place the following names on the Official List of Family-group Names in Zoology:
- (a) TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (type genus *Teius* Merrem, 1820), with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence, by use of the plenary powers in (1) above, whenever it and AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826, are applied to the same taxon;
- (b) AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (type genus *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795), with an endorsement that it is not to have priority over TEIIDAE Gray, 1827, whenever both names are applied to the same taxon;
- (5) to place the family name TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

SUPPLEMENTARY REFERENCES

- FITZINGER, L.J.F.J. 1826. *Neue Classification der Reptilien ...* Wien, Huebner, viii, 66 pp.
- MEYER, F.A.A. 1795. *Synopsis reptilium ...* Göttingen, 32 pp.
- PRESCH, W. 1981. TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (Reptilia, Sauria): proposed conservation. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 194–196.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *LECANIUM* BURMEISTER, 1835 (INSECTA, HOMOPTERA, COCCOIDEA) Z.N.(S.) 2125

(see vol. 38, pp. 147–152)

(1) by H. Komosińska (Warsaw Agricultural University)
and M. Mroczkowski (Zoological Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences,
Warsaw, Poland)

E.M. Danzig and I.M. Kerzhner (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 147–152, points 7–10) stated the case in relation to the generic name *Lecanium* which gave their reasons for asking the Commission to use its plenary powers. Their own opinion that to retain *Lecanium* now would cause more confusion in the nomenclature, does not seem to us well founded.

In spite of the transfer of the type species of *Lecanium* (*Lecanium hesperidum* Linnaeus sp.) and *Lecanium persicae* (Fabricius) to another genus, the name *Lecanium* is still used in the literature, especially in works concerning the applied field (Arias & others, 1964; Bailey, 1964; Boyce, 1965; Flanders, 1959; Flanders, 1970; Fullmer et al., 1959; Habib et al., 1971; Kagan & Lewartowski, 1977; Madsen